

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/693,143 10/24/2003		10/24/2003	Michael J. Berman	03-0702	1741 .	
24319	7590	05/23/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGI	C CORPO	RATION	ALEXANDER, MICHAEL P			
1621 BARE	BER LANE	3				
MS: D-106				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MILPITAS, CA 95035				1742		

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/693,143	BERMAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Michael P. Alexander	1742		

	Michael P. Alexander	1/42	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b)</li> </ol>	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo g date of the final rejection.	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C ust be filed within one	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) of the following
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, l  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>	·	·	
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-8.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☐ will not be entered, or b) 🗔 wi		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu		•	
see attached.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)	

Art Unit: 1742

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 16 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the cited references do not teach that the electrically conductive fluid would be chemically abrasive.

Firstly, applicant argues that the specification defines the term "chemically abrasive". The Examiner disagrees. No definition is provided. Furthermore, no examples are provided of what would be considered an abrasive electrolyte.

Secondly, applicant argues that a person of ordinary skill in the art of integrated circuit fabrication would not agree that water is chemically abrasive. In response, the Examiner notes that claims 1 and 3-8 are not limited to integrated circuit manufacture. Therefore, this argument is not relevant to claims 1 and 3-8. Furthermore, the applicant provides no evidence to support the argument.

Thirdly, applicant cites a passage from paragraph 0034 to support the argument that water would not be chemically abrasive. The Examiner wished to complete the passage cited. The inventive electrolyte is said to be different water-based and other conventional chemical mechanical polishing solutions in that it does not contain impurities. The cited paragraph does not support applicant's argument that water would not be considered to be chemically abrasive.

Art Unit: 1742

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-8558. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

nM

ROY KING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

mpa